

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JAN 10 2005**Siegesmund & Associates***Intellectual Property Attorneys & Counselors at Law*4627 N. Central Expressway  
Dallas, Texas 75205-4022  
214-528-2407 (voice)  
214-889-5060 (fax)  
www.siegesmund.com

## FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	FROM:
Examiner Sanjiv D. Shah	R. Siegesmund
COMPANY:	DATE:
USPTO, Art Unit 2176	1/10/2005
FAX NUMBER:	NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
703-873-9306	5
PHONE NUMBER:	RE:
571-272-4098	Response to Restriction Requirement
NOTES/COMMENTS:	

ATTN: Examiner Sanjiv D. Shah

Art Unit 2176

Re: Response to Restriction Requirement mailed 12/9/04

Application No. 09/981,882

Inventor: Charles Hooks

Apparatus and Method for Source Compression and Comparison

The information contained in and transmitted with this communication is: Subject to the Attorney-client Privilege; Attorney Work Product; or Confidential. It is intended only for the individual or entity described above. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or use of or reliance upon the information contained in and transmitted with this communication by or to anyone other than the recipient designated above by the sender, is unauthorized and strictly prohibited. Any communication erroneously transmitted to you should be immediately returned to the sender by U.S. Mail, or if authorization is granted by the sender, destroyed. If you have received this communication in error, please notify Siegesmund & Associates by telephone at 214-528-2407 immediately.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
Attorney Docket No. AUS920010741US1  
JAN 10 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 09/981,882  
Applicant: Hooks  
Filing Date: 10/18/2001  
Group Art Unit: 2176

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Hon. Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the restriction requirement from the Examiner mailed 12/09/2004, applicant elects for further examination the invention construed by the Examiner to be set forth in claims 1 through 17 (designated by the examiner as Group I).

Applicant traverses the examiner's restriction requirement because the examiner has improperly classified applicant's invention in class 715 rather than in class 707, and because the examiner has not established a prima facie case that the claims in the three groups are distinct.

The examiner improperly classified applicant's invention in class 715. Class 715 does not address comparing two multiple lines of source code or text to determine additions, deletions, or changes. Applicant submits that such an invention may be appropriately classified in class 707, the generic class for data processing apparatus and corresponding methods for retrieval, organization, and maintenance of a file or database. Class 715, chosen by the examiner,

Page 1

BEST AVAILABLE COPY